

Re: Wallace Yard Consent Decree - Litigation 📎

Clifford Villa to: Lawrence, Robert

08/29/2009 01:04 AM

Cc: "Trueblood, Craig", "Wurtzler, Gail", "Lawrence, Robert", "Himmelhoch, Sarah (ENRD)"

Bcc: Ed Moreen, Cyndy Mackey, Darrell.Early

Bob: Thanks for your message below. I forwarded it to Sarah in case it didn't make it through to her directly. Sarah can respond to your question about service and the stay.

Concerning the technical documents, I agreed to produce a slight revision of the SOW to incorporate the items we discussed on Thursday and Sara Handy agreed to produce a revised RAWP. I hope to have the revised SOW out by Weds. We expect the revised RAWP by the end of the week. As for the RADs, the Wallace-Mullan Branch CD drawings remain our standard for level of detail. If that can be accomplished in 3-4 weeks, that may be a good investment of time if done right. Again, this should not take as long as the Wallace-Mullan Branch design effort because we are dealing with a project that is much smaller in size (approx. 20% in terms of ROW length) and complexity, and we are not starting from zero.

If need be, I'll be in the office and available to talk all of next week.

Thanks.

Cliff Villa

Assistant Regional Counsel

U.S. EPA Region 10

"Lawrence, Robert" <Robert.Lawrence@dgsllaw.com>



"Lawrence, Robert"
<Robert.Lawrence@dgsllaw.com>

08/28/2009 PM 06:03

To "Himmelhoch, Sarah (ENRD)"
<Sarah.Himmelhoch@usdoj.gov>, Clifford
Villa/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc "Lawrence, Robert" <Robert.Lawrence@dgsllaw.com>,
"Wurtzler, Gail" <Gail.Wurtzler@dgsllaw.com>, "Trueblood,
Craig" <craig.trueblood@klgates.com>

Subject Wallace Yard Consent Decree - Litigation

Confidential Settlement Communication

Submitted under FRE 408

Re: Wallace Yard Consent Decree and Litigation

Sarah and Cliff,

I'm not sure whether my e-mails to Sara are getting through the DOJ firewall. Some are returned with a "can't deliver" note. In any event, I wanted to be sure that both of you were aware of the following:

- 1) Neither Gail nor I can waive service for UP. Bob Bylsma, UP's in-house counsel based out of Sacramento, has the authority to do this in certain

situations. Bob's number is 916-789-6229. Please advise me if you are interested in Bob possibly accepting or waiving service for UP, and I will give him a heads up that you will be giving him a call.

2) Based upon our telephone call with Cliff, Ed Moreen and Nick Zilka yesterday, it appears that we are making good progress towards settlement. The vast majority of the remaining issues appear related to the degree of detail that EPA wants in the RAD drawings and the RAWP, and not on major significant technical differences of opinion. The language in the CD and SOW is final, subject of course to our respective clients final management review and approval.

3) As we advised Cliff, Ed and Nick, we think the last set of RAD drawings that we provided to EPA supplied more than enough detail for the Agencies to understand, review and approve the response actions that the RRs will be undertaking, and to oversee these actions in the field. Nevertheless, in the interest of settlement, we are willing to provide more detail so long as EPA understands that it will take time to undertake the necessary field work and to revise the RAD drawings appropriately. EPA has indicated that the level of detail set forth in the Wallace Mullan Branch Trail of the Coeur d'Alene CD RAD drawings may be appropriate in certain instances. But those Trail RAD drawings took well over a year to develop (sometimes even longer) often involving many revisions. Further, the Trail of the Coeur d'Alene's was a more complex project; the level of detail in those drawings is not necessary for the Spur Line drawings. In any event, to prepare RAD drawings like those under the Wallace Mullan Branch CD for the Trail of the Coeur d'Alenes would take a minimum of three to four weeks. This could be done, but in our view is unnecessary and would result in further delays in lodging of the CD. As a compromise, we suggest that the parties agree that some level of additional detail between that set forth in the Coeur d'Alene RAD drawings and our current set of RAD drawings is sufficient and would give the Agencies sufficient detail to better understand the work that will be done and to oversee this work. The more detail that is required, the more time it will take for us to get the drawings to the Agency; the less detail required the more quickly we can deliver the RAD drawings.

4) UP cannot sign the Consent Decree until the Parties have come to final agreement on the RAD Drawings that will be attached to the CD at the staff level, and UP management has reviewed and approved the final CD. Because this will take some time for the reasons described above, we suggest that the U.S. file a motion advising Judge Lodge that we are making good progress towards settlement, and requesting that the Judge stay the case while the parties work out the final issues in settlement. This would allow the parties to focus on achieving settlement rather than expending time, energy and money on unnecessary litigation. We appreciate the fact that the U.S. has held off on service to date, and request that the U.S. continue to refrain from serving the summons and complaint unless the unlikely event occurs that settlement discussions have broken down.

Let's discuss the above next week at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[original signed by]

Robert W. Lawrence
Davis Graham & Stubbs LLP
1550 17th Street, Suite 500
Denver, CO 80202-1500
303-892-7409 direct
303-892-9400 main
(b) (6)
303-893-1379 fax
robert.lawrence@dgsllaw.com